

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36087

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 545 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: July 23, 2009 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| EDWARD DEAN OLSON, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| |) | OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) | BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| |) | |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael R. McLaughlin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and consecutive unified sentences of fourteen years, with seven years determinate for forgery, and seven years with one year determinate for possession of methamphetamine, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth Ann Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Edward Dean Olson pled guilty to forgery, Idaho Code § 18-3601 and possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). The district court sentenced Olson to consecutive unified terms of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years for forgery and seven years with a minimum period of confinement of one year for possession of methamphetamine. Olson appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established.

See State v. Hernandez, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Olson's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.